

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Morgan et al.

Serial No.: 09/088,674

Filed: 06/02/1998

For: BOUNDARY DISPERSION FOR MITIGATING PWM TEMPORAL CONTOURING  
ARTIFACTS IN DIGITAL DISPLAYS

Art Unit: 2674

Examiner: Nguyen, K.

Docket No. TI-25995




2674  
8 / leg for  
beconsid  
3-21-01  
clm

Response

March 14, 2001

Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, DC 20231

RECEIVED  
MAR 20 2001  
Technology Center 2600

MAILING CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.8(A)	
I hereby certify that the above correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231 on the date shown below.	
	3-14-2001
Charles A. Brill	Date

Dear Sir:

In response to the Examiner's Action mailed 14 December 2000, applicant responds as follows:

REMARKS

This application was originally filed on 2 June 1998 with ten claims, two of which were written in independent form. No claims have been allowed. Claims 1 and 6 were amended on 4 October 2000.

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,094,187 to Jones et al. (Jones). The applicant respectfully disagrees.

"For a prior art reference to anticipate in terms of 35 U.S.C. § 102, every element of the claimed invention must be identically shown in a single reference." *Diversitech Corp. v. Century Steps, Inc.*, 850 F.2d 675, 677, 7 U.S.P.Q.2D (BNA) 1315, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 1988). The Examiner has not met the Examiner's burden of presenting a prima facie case of anticipation since there has been no effort to read the teachings of Jones on the recited limitations of Claims 1 and 6, from which Claims 2-5 and 7-10 depend.

AO